

He is former dean and acting president of Meharry Medical College in Nashville, widely praised for bringing new vitality to the school. He has initiated a successful program to discourage teen-age pregnancies called "I Have a Future."

His nomination is praised by Dr. Louis Sullivan, a former Secretary of Health and Human Services under President Bush and himself a medical school president.

The White House bungled the Foster nomination process by failing to get the facts straight about his background in abortions and related matters, but that is no discredit to the nominee. Certainly, the president could have found a less controversial nominee. (He could have chosen a dermatologist, for example).

But the important fact is that Foster is the nominee. He is the president's choice. He has a significant record of leadership in the medical profession. There is not the slightest hint of unethical or illegal conduct. Unless some shocking revelation comes to light, he deserves confirmation by a strong bipartisan vote. ●

PEACEKEEPING SAVES LIVES

● Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, in catching up on my reading, I came across an op-ed piece in the Washington Post by Brian Urquhart, who has contributed to U.N. peacekeeping efforts throughout the world in a significant way, until his retirement from the United Nations.

In his op-ed piece, he makes the point that John Foster Dulles said that a peacekeeping force was desirable and that compared to what we do in general, expenditure on arms is an economically way to bring stability to the world.

How right he is.

If we were to even suggest that we spend 1 percent of our defense budget on U.N. peacekeeping, it would be a significant and helpful shift for the United States, as well as for the world.

At this point, I ask that the op-ed piece by Brian Urquhart be printed in the RECORD.

The opinion piece follows:

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 16, 1995]

PEACE-KEEPING SAVES LIVES

(By Brian Urquhart)

"As you know the United States . . . has a strong interest in the early establishment of standby arrangements for a United Nations Peace Force. The interest of the American people in this concept is further demonstrated by the fact that during the past year resolutions were adopted by both the House of Representatives and the Senate calling for the establishment of a United Nations force."

These words, written by an American secretary of state, John Foster Dulles, to a U.N. secretary general, Dag Hammarskjöld, are a good measure of how different the climate in Washington is these days toward the idea of U.N. peacekeeping operations.

"I want to assure you that the United States is prepared to assist you in every feasible manner in strengthening the capacity of the United Nations to discharge its responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security, a task to which you have already contributed so much," Dulles wrote in that 1958 letter.

Hammarskjöld responded cautiously. At that high point in the Cold War he feared that a standing U.N. force, actively opposed

by the Soviet Union, would become a political football between East and West, destroying the fragile innovation of peace-keeping which he had pioneered during the Suez crisis of 1956 and the Lebanon crisis of 1958.

President Eisenhower and Dulles, on the other hand, evidently saw a standby U.N. peace-keeping capacity as being greatly in the interest of the United States. In fact, just 18 months later Eisenhower, pressed by the new prime minister of the Congo for U.S. intervention there, adroitly referred him to the United Nations. The resulting peacekeeping operation was widely regarded as an extraordinary success in dealing with the chaos there.

Since that time the United Nations has undertaken some 25 such assignments of varying sizes in different parts of the world. Given the desperate origins of most of these operations, it is scarcely surprising that not all have achieved all their objectives. But it is worth noting that in the present controversy over peace-keeping, the successful operations—which constitute the majority—are seldom mentioned.

In recent months, for example, there has been much discussion of placing U.S. troops in the Golan Heights as part of the Middle East peace process, but little mention of the U.N. Disengagement Observer Force, which has successfully presided over peace on the Golan Heights since 1974. Somalia and Bosnia are constantly invoked, but the Nobel Peace Prize of 1988 and later successes in Namibia, Cambodia, El Salvador and Mozambique are routinely forgotten.

The prevailing attitude in Washington toward U.N. peace-keeping these days seems to be a radical reversal of the earlier U.S. attitude. The impression is often given now that past U.S. support of these efforts was an aberration, a charitable—and largely unwise—gesture of condescension. But in fact, from Suez in 1956 to the present time, U.N. peace-keeping has far more often been a vital element of U.N. foreign policy.

During the Cold War, it was vital to maintaining international peace and security, because, among other things, it kept regional conflicts out of the U.S.-Soviet orbit and lessened the potential of such conflicts for provoking nuclear East-West confrontation.

In the post-Cold War world, that motivation for supporting peace-keeping no longer exists. The United Nations' new involvements are for the most part in massive civil and ethnic conflicts where human, not international, security is involved, although such disasters often cause major destabilization in neighboring states as well as strong emotional reactions worldwide. It is this change in the basic character of conflict that has led the more vocal opponents of U.N. peace-keeping to argue that there is little or no U.S. national interest in it.

But as Charles William Maynes has pointed out in testimony before the House International Relations Committee, today's great powers are "like the most successful members of any community. They have a stake in the general health of the community. They cannot and should not be the world's policeman."

Great powers have major economic and other interests in global stability, but they find it increasingly unwise to intervene on their own in regional conflicts. It was considerations such as these that underlay the enthusiasm of Dulles and Eisenhower for building up the peace-keeping capacity of the United Nations. Even the United Nations' most criticized operations such as UNPROFOR in ex-Yugoslavia often serve as a useful pretext for avoiding more intensive U.S. involvement and a screen for differences with allies. Imperfect though they are, they also save thousands of lives.

U.N. peace-keeping can be, and will continue to be, an invaluable—even an indispensable—instrument of peace. Its capacity and effectiveness need to be strengthened, not diminished. To be sure, new forms, rules and methods, including a training system, need to be developed. But the cost of peace-keeping—contrary to widespread belief—is small by comparison with the cost of massive military involvement, which timely peace-keeping often succeeds in making unnecessary. John Foster Dulles got it right. ●

DIRECT LOANS BENEFIT STUDENTS

● Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, we are going to hear a lot about direct lending during the coming months.

It is a success for everyone but the people who profit from the present system. I want banks in America to be successful, but if we are going to subsidize banks, we ought to do it openly and not do it in the name of aiding students.

The Daily Illini, which is the student newspaper of the University of Illinois, had an editorial recently about direct lending. The University of Illinois is one of the schools that is now on the direct lending program.

I think my colleagues would be interested in what the student editorial says. I ask that it be printed in the RECORD.

The editorial follows:

[From the Daily Illini, Jan. 31, 1995]

DIRECT LOANS BENEFIT STUDENTS

Students love direct lending. College administrators love direct lending. So why are the House Republicans thinking of limiting the program?

William Goodling, House Economic and Educational Opportunities Committee chairperson, wants to cap the number of new student loans under direct lending at 40 percent, which is how large the program is expected to grow in the next academic year. The original legislation called for a 60 percent growth in the program by the 1998-99 academic year.

Goodling's reasoning is not clear yet, but there are already plenty of reasons why direct lending should be expanded, not curtailed.

The old system of going through the Student Loan Marketing Association, or Sallie Mae, doesn't work well. Students have to negotiate a long process involving complicated forms. And the overhead has been huge. Besides Sallie Mae, the federal government operates a system of more than 35 "guarantee agencies" to collect payments and repay on defaulted loans.

By contrast, the year-old direct lending program delivers loans fast and without hassle. As a result, the University has seen fewer students encumbered during registration for the spring semester and fewer student deferring payments or needing emergency loans, according to Orlo Austin, director of the office of student financial aid.

His office has also benefited from having control at the local level. Direct lending is less complex than the federal guaranteed-loan system because schools do not have to cut through a massive bureaucracy to get ahead of students' payments, he said.

And Austin isn't the only administrator happy with the program. "(Direct lending) makes those of us in financial aid more sophisticated and user-friendly in helping to